

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1 and 37-66 are currently pending in the present application with Claims 1 and 37 being independent claims and the remaining claims (Claims 38-66) being dependent claims. Claims 1 and 37 have been amended without adding new matter. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 1 and 37-66 in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

Claim Objections

Claim 66 was objected due to a formality in which the Examiner suggested amending the preamble of Claim 66 to recite “A computer-readable medium having a stored computer program in a storage medium for controlling an image processing comprising:”. Claim 66 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the objection to Claim 66 is believed to have been overcome. As such, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 37-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,362) (hereinafter, “Kato et al.”).

Claims 37 and 65-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Owens et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0202110) (hereinafter, “Owens et al.”).

Claim 1 is directed to an image processing apparatus and includes: “a range designating unit adapted to designate a selected range of images from an original range of images comprising a plurality of images, the selected range of images beginning with a start frame and ending with an end frame; a trimming designating unit adapted to designate trimming areas of the start frame and/or the end frame; a generating unit adapted to extract frames in the selected range

of images designated by said range designating unit, cut out trimming areas of all the extracted frames including frames other than the start frame and the end frame based on the trimming areas of said start and/or end frames designated by said trimming designating unit, and generate continuous still images from the trimming areas cut out of the extracted frames, wherein positions and/or sizes of the area to be cut out are changed from positions and/or sizes of the trimming areas; and an output control unit adapted to output the continuous still images generated by said generating unit.”

Claim 1 has a feature that when determining areas to be cut out, the areas are slightly changed from the determined trimming areas on purpose so that, because of the changes, a series of a plurality of images can produce larger motions rather than small motions when the motions of the images are originally small. By having this feature, a user can produce an interesting series of still images with more visual motions such as artificial pan/tilt/zoom.

As shown in Fig. 13, positions and/or sizes relative to a whole image from which images are cut out are different between a trimming area determined by the trimming area determining unit (the cutout area in 1ST and N-TH in Fig. 13) and the area determined by area determination unit (the cutout area in n-TH in Fig. 13).

As described in paragraph [0082], when the two trimming areas are set on the start screen and on the end screen of the continuous still images and the positions and/or sizes of the two trimming areas are different from each other, they are linearly changed.

On the other hand, the Kato et al. reference teaches generating an image to be cutout that has been approved by a director. It does not teach or suggest a feature to make a change in an area to be cut out in comparison to the trimming area determined by a director when determining the area to be cut out. Instead, the Kato et al. reference discloses a feature that even if the trimming area determined by the director is squeezed, the trimming area in the squeezed image will be positioned in relatively same area as an area where the trimming area of the original size was positioned. With this feature of the Kato et al. reference,

image of the trimming area determined on a film and an image cut out from the squeezed image will be identical.

By considering the objectives of the Kato et al. reference discussed above, it is obvious that the features of the present invention that, when determining a cutout area, positions and/or sizes of the area to be cut out are changed from that of the trimming area determined by a director, will not be a desirable feature for the Kato's invention. In other words, the Kato et al. reference teaches away from this feature of Claim 1.

The Owens et al. reference does not teach or suggest a feature to perform cropping on images other than images selected by an operator. Thus, it is impossible to disclose a feature to make a change in the non-selected images, in order to perform cropping.

As described above, Claim 1 recites features that are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed allowable.

Independent Claim 37 includes features similar to those discussed above with reference to Claim 1 and is believed allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

The remaining claims (i.e., Claims 38-66) are dependent claims. As discussed above, all of the independent claims are believed allowable. Therefore, the dependent claims are also believed allowable because they depend from an allowable base claim. Furthermore, each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, and individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully request that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior

art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

May 23, 2008

/Marlene Klein/

Date

Marlene Klein, Reg. No. 43,718
Patent Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: (949) 932-3132
Fax: (949) 932-3560